



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/635,398 | 08/06/2003 | David Anderson | 21402-593C (CURA-893C) | 1203 |
| 30623 | 7590 | 03/16/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111 | | | BORIN, MICHAEL L | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | 1631 |

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/635,398 | ANDERSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael Borin | 1631 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-45 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group I, claims 1-7, drawn to polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

Group II, claim 8, drawn to a method of manufacturing a medicament.

Group III, claim 10, drawn to a method of determining presence of disease by measuring peptide expression, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group IV, claims 11,12, drawn to a method of identifying an agent that binds to polypeptide of Group I, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group V, claim 13, drawn to a method for identifying a therapeutic agent by contacting a cell with a candidate substance capable of binding to peptide of Group I, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.

Group VI, claims 14,15, drawn to a method for screening for predisposition to pathology, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group VII, claim 16, drawn to a method of modulating activity of polypeptide of Group I.

Group VIII, claims 17-19, drawn to method of treatment using polypeptide of Group I, classified in class 514, subclass 02.

Group IX, claims 20-28,36-45, drawn to polynucleotide, vector, cell, and method of producing polypeptide, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1 and class 935, subclass 66.

Group X, claims 29-33,9, drawn to antibody and use thereof, classified in class 514, subclass 388.1.

Group XI, claims 32-34, drawn to method for determining presence of nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Group XII, claim 35, drawn to method for determining predisposition to a disease, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and IX are separate and distinct because the inventions are directed to different chemical types regarding the critical limitations therein. For Group IX, the critical feature is a polypeptide whereas for Group I the critical feature is a polynucleotide. It is acknowledged that various processing steps may cause a polypeptide of group IX to be directed as to its synthesis by a polynucleotide of Group I, however, the completely separate chemical types of the inventions of Groups I and IX supports the undue search burden if both were examined together. Additionally, polypeptides have been most commonly, albeit not always, separately characterized and published in the Biochemical literature, thus significantly adding to the search burden if examiner together, as compared to being searched separately. Also, it is pointed out that processing that may connect two groups does not prevent them from

being viewed as distinct, because enough processing can result in producing any composition from any other composition if the processing is not so limited to additions, subtractions, enzyme actions, etc. In addition, neither the products in each Group, nor the products of Groups I and IX share a common structure which elicits a common activity as to constitute a proper Markush listing. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 11-20 are drawn to improper generic and Markush claims.

Inventions I and X are separate and distinct as the polypeptides of Invention II are structurally and biochemically different than the antibodies of Invention X. While the antibodies may bind to the polypeptides of Invention I, the biochemical activities of each Invention are quite different, requiring differing methods and areas of search, which would impose an undue burden upon the examiner.

Inventions IX and X are separate and distinct, as the claims of Invention IX are drawn to polynucleotides, while the claim of group X is drawn to an antibody. These are differing biochemical entities having differing biochemical properties, structures and effects. Invention X would require searching in areas unrelated to polynucleotides, and as such, would require an undue burden on the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions I and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptides can be used in expression profiles or in protein synthesis.

Inventions II-VIII, XI, XII are drawn to independent and/or patentably distinct methods that are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with

an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on a plurality of independent and/or patentably distinct sequences. Each peptide or nucleic acid sequence is independent and/or patentably distinct because they are unrelated compounds, there is no disclosed core structure required for a common utility, and because each of these compounds possess different structure and/or physico-chemical properties, and/or capable of separate manufacture and/or use. **For an elected Group the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid or nucleic acid sequence.**

Applicant is advised that this is a restriction requirement and should not be construed as an election of species.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and the necessity for non-coextensive literature searches restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571)272-0713. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Michael Borin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631

mlb